

REMARKS

The Applicant has amended the claims of the instant application to more specifically define the instant invention over the prior art cited by the Examiner. Specifically, the Applicant has amended independent apparatus claim 29 to more clearly define the structure of two components of a field joint. The claimed structure includes an edge component and a lip component which is capable of surrounding the edge component. Such an arrangement is neither disclosed nor taught by the prior art cited by the Examiner. As has been discussed previously by the Applicant, the prior art discloses metal lock joints in which two pieces of metal are first placed together with one edge portion extending beyond the other, then the extended edge portion is folded over the other edge portion. Alternatively, the instant invention discloses components of a joint in which the two components may be manufactured in the factory and later joined together in the field (away from the factory) without necessitating any special equipment to accomplish any folding in the field. In addition, the joint may be disassembled without resulting in any destruction of the components or portions thereof. The Applicant notes the Examiner's position regarding product-by-process claim limitations. Nevertheless, claim 29 as currently written does not claim a field joint, but instead claims two components which may be connected together to form a field joint. The prior art does not disclose such components.

The method claims have been amended to more clearly define the manner in which the two sink/machine portions are joined together. As is currently claims, the lip of one portion is positioned over an edge of the other portion. This step, which is neither disclosed nor taught by the prior art, provides a number of benefits over prior art methods, such as allowing the weight of the portion having the lip to be utilized to force the two portions into tight engagement with each other.

The Applicant believes all claims in the instant application now to be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejections be withdrawn.

Reconsideration of the application as amended respectfully is requested. The foregoing amendment and remarks are believed to be responsive to every matter raised in the office action. If, however, some matter has been overlooked, an opportunity to correct the oversight would be appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,



Bryan P. Stanley
Patent Office Reg. No. 44,352
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
4520 Main Street, Suite 1100
Kansas City, Missouri 64111
Telephone: (816) 460-2410
Facsimile: (816) 531-7545

Attorneys for Applicant